

THE  
ANTI-SLAVERY RECORD.

VOL. III. No. III.

MARCH, 1837.

WHOLE No. 27.

THE SLAVEHOLDER'S HEART.

WE are often told of the kind feelings which are reciprocated between master and slave. The master, it is said, regards his slaves as thrown by Providence under his protection—a part of his family—objects of his fatherly care—he lives to promote their best interests. In return, the slaves are attached to their master, and would die to defend him. They make his interests their own, and rejoice in all his prosperity.

It will be the object of the following pages to refer to some of the exhibitions which slaveholders and their representatives have, in various ways and on various occasions, made of their feelings towards slaves. These exhibitions will perhaps enable us to test the likeness of the picture to which we have alluded. We shall be able to estimate the value of that fatherly care which a slave receives, placed, soul and body, at the disposal of a heart which feels towards him a sovereign contempt, and a stubborn determination to persevere in stripping him of all the attributes of manhood.

The most reproachful epithet that a slaveholder can bestow upon his opponent, is the term *slave*. In expressing their determination not to submit to northern interference, the slaveholders of the south have been able to find no stronger language than this, Were we to permit such interference, we should be fit to be SLAVES. In expressing their abhorrence of the tariff, they told us it reduced them to the condition of SLAVES. With them there seems to be a force and meaning in the word *slave*, which fits it to express the superlative of meanness and misery—to cap the climax of contempt. There is also among slaveholders a peculiar jealousy for their own freedom. "The loudest yelps for liberty," truly, are heard amongst them. If we are to credit their professions, it is with them that liberty has built her altar, and

cherishes her purest flame. Now, on the supposition that the slaves are held in bondage for their own good, that they are kindly treated as a part of their master's family, &c., how shall we account for the intensity of meaning which the slaveholders give to the terms *slave* and *freeman*? What should we think of the sea-captain, who used *sailor* as a term of the deepest reproach? What, of the master mechanic, who could find no epithet more expressive of his scorn than *apprentice*? Who would sail under such a captain, or serve under such a master? When the non-slaveholder uses *slave* as a term of reproach, it is in reference to tyranny unworthily submitted to. He blames the victim of oppression for his cowardly tameness in submitting to wrong. But why is it that the slaveholder gives a more reproachful meaning to the term, if it be not that he better knows the amount of the tyranny to which the slaves submit?—and knows that tongue cannot exaggerate it? Is the pattern on his own plantation, the original who sits for the horrid likeness, a being to whom he is generously attached?—a being who performs the duties of an honorable relation to himself?—a being who lives and acts in his proper place? Were this true, it would be a reason why he should carefully abstain from all scornful allusion to the humility of his condition. But it cannot be true. The slaveholders of the south have a *meaning for the word SLAVE*, which they would never dare to let come to the ears of their slaves, unless the latter were the victims of unutterably cruel physical oppression—and this *meaning* cannot be accounted for, except on the supposition that their *hearts* are full of present and practical contempt for their slaves. “Whom they have injured, him they hate.”

And you ask us, the slaves might well say, to submit our lives and fortunes, and the lives and fortunes of our children, to these men of the South, in that very condition which they hold in the most sovereign contempt! When they rack their invention to find a word which shall describe the last extremity of human wretchedness—worse than death itself—they find the word *slave*; and you ask us to be their *slaves*!!

Look at another exhibition which has been made before heaven and earth by a nation of slaveholders—a nation that maintains the right of the majority to rule, of a colony to throw off the yoke of a tyrannous mother country, and of every people who have vindicated their independence by the sword, to have it acknowledged and respected by other nations. Look and learn. Slaveholders themselves will not

deny that the slaves of St. Domingo, under the old French régime, were horribly abused. In the process of time, these slaves were made freemen. Having tasted liberty, they scorned to be reënslaved. They shivered the yokes which their old masters sought to reimpose. They drove the minions of Bonaparte from their shore. After a war of less than two years, except the 60,000 in their graves, not a Frenchman of the invading host was left upon the island in the month of November, 1803, to question their independence. They fortified that independence with a regular government. Where was our chivalric admiration of liberty and independence, that it did not step forth to welcome them to a standing among the nations of the earth? Was it the remembrance of our own revolutionary struggle, or, of our own "contented and happy peasantry" at the South, which came in to hold back from the heroes of St. Domingo, the greeting we have been forward to give to the revolutionists of France, of Greece, of Poland? Greeting! After St. Domingo had been free and independent more than two years, we leagued ourselves, good republicans that we were, with the "throne-builder" of Europe, to *starve* a nation of freemen whom his arms could not conquer! It was not enough that in 1791, when the slaves struck for freedom from their masters, our Executive had taken the responsibility of placing arms and money at the disposal of the French minister,\* to help those masters crush them back into subjection. In 1806, when the victorious people of St. Domingo had calmly settled down to the arts of peace under a government which even Bonaparte dared not disturb with his muskets and bloodhounds, the congress of the United States, at the instance of that grasping autocrat, passed a rigid non-intercourse, *starvation* law, whereby any American forfeited ship and cargo, if he presumed to trade with that people. We give an extract from this shameful law,—for fear some of our patriotic and whole-hearted fellow-citizens should doubt its existence:†—

\* Thomas Jefferson, then Secretary of State, writes to Wm. Short, our minister at Paris, under date of Nov. 24, 1791, as follows:—"When the insurrection of their negroes assumed a very threatening appearance, the Assembly [of St. Domingo] sent a deputy here to ask assistance of military stores and provisions. He addressed himself to M. de Ternant, who (the President being then in Virginia, as I was also) applied to the Secretaries of the Treasury and War. They furnished 1,000 stand of arms, other military stores, and placed forty thousand dollars in the treasury subject to the order of M. de Ternant, to be laid out in provisions, or otherwise, as he should think best. He sent the arms and other military stores," &c.—*Jefferson's Correspondence*, vol. 3, p. 133.

† This act passed the Senate Feb. 20th, 1806—Yeas 21, Nays 8. It was con-



"Sec. 2d. *And be it further enacted*, That after due notice of this act at the several custom-houses, no ship or vessel whatever shall receive a clearance for any port or place within the island of St. Domingo, and not in the actual possession of France: nor shall any clearance be granted for a foreign voyage to any ship or vessel, owned, hired, or employed wholly or in part, by any person resident in the United States, until the owner or the employer for the voyage, or his factor or agent with the master, shall give bond to the United States, in a sum equal to the value of the vessel and of her cargo, with condition that the ship or vessel for which a clearance shall be required, is destined to some port or place without the limits of such part of the island of St. Domingo as shall not be in the actual possession and under the acknowledged government of France, and during the intended voyage shall not be voluntarily carried, or permitted to proceed, whether directly or from any intermediate port or place, to any port or place within such part of the island of St. Domingo," &c.

Was such an act passed in regard to the revolted South American colonies? or Mexico? or Greece? or will one be passed in regard to Texas? Can we plead that St. Domingo or Haiti had not an organized, an efficient government? No. From the diplomatic correspondence submitted to congress during the passage of the law, it appears that Haiti not only had a government but an efficient one, under which the rights and interests of foreigners trading with her, as well as of her own citizens, were well protected. General Turreau, the French minister at Washington, in an official note of unparalleled impudence, while speaking of the Haitians as "robbers," as "that race of African slaves, the reproach and the refuse of nature," complains that a lucrative commerce was carried on with them from all our ports. And Talleyrand, in a letter to General Armstrong, our minister at Paris, calls his attention to a passage in one of our newspapers, in which was described a "*feast*" given by some merchants of New York, on the return of their vessels from Haiti. "The ninth toast," says Talleyrand, "given to the *government* of Haiti, cannot fail, sir, to excite your indignation."\*

Comment on this foul and shameful piece of legislation is quite unnecessary. It shows out *the heart of the slaveholder*. Almost every vote of opposition to the law came from the north. The slaves are placed under masters capable of joining with a tyrant in his mean attempt to *starve* that young liberty which had triumphed over his best legions, because forsooth the new freemen had once been "African slaves."

passed by the House of Representatives Feb. 25, 1806—Yeas 93, Nays 26. Among its opposers in the Senate is the name of JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

\* State Papers, 1801—6, p. 364.

In the same spirit of mean hatred, our government has always refused to recognise the political independence of Haiti. Our commissioners to the celebrated congress of Panama were even instructed to oppose the recognition of Haiti in that body. Said Mr. Berrien of Georgia in the debate on the Panama mission, "We must hold language equally decisive to the Spanish American States. We cannot allow their principle of universal emancipation to be called into activity in a situation where its contagion from our neighborhood would be dangerous to our quiet and safety." It would seem as though slaveholding had extinguished every spark of generosity in the slaveholder's heart.

The meanness of slaveholding, by a sort of conventional license, has leave to stalk abroad in open daylight. It does not strive to conceal itself. What is it that the slaveholder professes to fear above all things? Insurrection. The loss of his power. The fair retribution which he avows that he himself would visit upon his oppressor, were he in the place of his slave. The slaveholders, together with their particular friends at the north, justify all their outrageous violations of law and order, by their *fear of insurrection*. 'Look at our circumstances,' they say; 'you of the north can afford to be calm while you discuss this question. You can throw firebrands, and smile—you have nothing to lose by it. But if your homes were like ours, upon a magazine of powder, it would be a very different affair.' The bonfires of Anti-Slavery publications at Charleston and Richmond; the robberies of the mail; the lynching of "innocent men," as at Farmville, Virginia; the flogging of Amos Dresser at Nashville; the murder by scores of untried men, on suspicion of a design to rise; the burning of men alive—without judge or jury; the acquittal of these horrid murderers on account of their *numbers*; all these things show how much the slaveholders *fear*—and FEAR is always CRUEL. It is the fear of having the slaves understand their rights that embodies and animates and impels the whole host of their tyrants; and of all the meanness or baseness of heart under the canopy of heaven, this same craven fear is the worst. What! do you ask me to be the slave of a man who dreads to have me learn the alphabet; who is in terrors lest I should read a printed book; who is horrified at the bare thought of my being able to write my name!

But we have been lately furnished with another illustration of the proud contempt, strangely mingled with base fear, with which slaveholders look upon their slaves.

One would think that kind, fatherly, patriarchal men, would look graciously upon all petitions coming from the poor and weak, and especially from those whom Providence had thrown under their own guardianship. It is not so hard to be understood how they should feel themselves insulted by foreigners petitioning on behalf of their "contented and happy peasantry;" but if individuals of that peasantry itself, feeling themselves in some respect aggrieved, should think it proper to address the assembled legislators of their country, we are bound to believe that the representatives of slaveholders would be the first to listen to their complaints, and the readiest to redress them. What other conduct can we possibly reconcile with their pretensions? They pretend that slavery makes its subjects contented and happy. It quells their desires, satisfies their wants, relieves them of their cares and anxieties. This is its business. Well, if any slaves should after all feel and express desires, will the masters, who live only for their good, satisfy and make them happy by contemptuously refusing to hear their prayer, denying their right to make it, and abusing them as if they had been horses or dogs? If so, we cannot understand *how* it is that slavery makes men happy.

The hearts of slaveholders in regard to the petitions of slaves have just been tested. On the 6th of February, 1837, the HON. JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, while presenting petitions to the House of Representatives of the United States, said,

"He held in his hand a petition from twenty-two persons, declaring themselves to be SLAVES. He wished to know whether the Chair considered this as a paper coming within the order of the House. He would withhold the petition until the decision was made."

The "order of the House" referred to by Mr. Adams, was "that all papers, petitions, and memorials, on the subject of the abolition of slavery, be laid on the table." Not a word had Mr. Adams said of the nature of the prayer. What right had the patriarchs to suppose that it was for the abolition of that providential arrangement whereby their humble dependants possess a happiness greater than freedom? Mr. Adams knew that it was not for the abolition of slavery; but as petitions had been subjected to the rule merely for the words *slaves* or *slavery*, he thought it not best to present it till he had obtained the decision of the chair. The chair thought it a "novel case," and left it to the decision of the House. Upon this the following display of patriarchal kindness and benignity took place:

"Mr. Lewis," of Alabama, "said it was in the power of the House



to PUNISH this atrocious attempt to present a petition from SLAVES to this House. If not, *we had better go home.*" Several gentlemen here cried out that the member from Mass. ought to be instantly expelled from the House.

"Mr. Alford," of Georgia, "said, the moment the petition was presented and came within the power of the House, he should move that it be taken from the files and burnt. He called on Southern members to support him in this course. *If this state of things was to be tolerated, the Union would not survive another session.*"

"Mr. Thompson, of South Carolina, rose to ask the member from Massachusetts to present his petition, or to move its reading. He would then bring himself within a resolution of a personal character, which he held in his hand: [a resolution expelling Mr. Adams from the House.]"

"Mr. Ripley, of Louisiana, came in front of the Chair, and addressed the Speaker. He said he did not intend to sit here deliberating upon the question of receiving petitions from SLAVES. If it had come to that, he was for taking a course adequate to the crisis. The Speaker interfered. The gentleman from Louisiana could not be allowed to speak while the yeas and nays were being called. Mr. Ripley accordingly retired."

"Mr. Bouldin wished not to be kept in suspense upon this point. He wished to know whether he was right in believing that he was surrounded by brokers sitting in consultation upon the interest, the prosperity, happiness, and glory of their common family and country, or whether a portion, a considerable portion, were willing to countenance a proposition of this kind—a proposition that could admit of no interpretation milder than that of a direct insult to the feelings of the South. The most natural import, a direct attack upon the interest, the property, and the safety, of the slaveholding portion of the Union."

"Mr. W. Thompson, of South Carolina, said he had risen to move as an amendment to the motion of the honorable gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Patton) the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the honorable JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, by the attempt just made by him to introduce a petition purporting on its face to be from slaves, has been guilty of a gross disrespect to this House, and that he be instantly brought to the bar to receive the severe censure of the Speaker."

Mr. Thompson said, "The gentleman from Massachusetts offered to present a petition from slaves, and so purporting to be on its face, in open and wilful violation of what he knew to be the rules of this House, and insulting to a large portion of its members. Does the gentleman, even in the latitude which he gives to the right of petition, think that it includes slaves? If he does not, he has wilfully violated the rules of the House and the feelings of its members. Does that gentleman know that there are laws in all the slave states, and here, for the punishment of those who excite insurrection? I can tell him that there are such things as grand juries; and if, sir, the juries of this District have, as I doubt not they have, proper intelligence and spirit, he may yet be made amenable to another tribunal, and we may yet see an incendiary brought to condign punishment."

Some modification of the resolutions was proposed by Mr. Haynes of Georgia, and the following, suggested by Mr. Lewis, was accepted by Mr. Thompson :

*"Resolved, That JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, a member from the state of Massachusetts, by his attempt to introduce into this House a petition from slaves, for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, committed an outrage on the rights and feelings of a large portion of the People of this Union; a flagrant contempt on the dignity of this House; and, by extending to slaves a privilege only belonging to freemen, directly invites the slave population to insurrection: and that the said member be forthwith called to the bar of the House, and be censured by the Speaker."*

Up to this period, the representatives of slaveholders had driven forward with the most furious madness, utterly overlooking the question whether the petition prayed for the abolition of slavery or not, when they were told that if they had permitted the petition to be read, it would have appeared that it prayed for an object directly the reverse, and might be, and probably was, a *hoax* played off by slaveholders themselves, to bring contempt upon Mr. Adams; but which he had used, as he had a right to, to draw from the House an expression of opinion in regard to the question whether the right of petition belongs to slaves. This development served still further to draw out the hearts of slaveholders :

"Mr. Thompson said he was sorry to see the air of levity which it is attempted to throw over this matter. He felt very differently. What, sir, is it a mere trifle to hoax, to trifle with the members from the South in this way, and on this subject? Is it a light thing, for the amusement of others, to irritate, almost to madness, the whole delegation from the slave states? Sir, it is an aggravation. It is intimated that the petition does not pray for the abolition of slavery, but a very different object. It makes not the slightest difference; it is the attempt to introduce a petition from slaves for any object; as insolent if it be for one purpose as for another. It is the naked fact of a presentation of a petition from slaves."

"Mr. T. then further modified his resolution by substituting the three following resolutions :

"1. *Resolved, That the Hon. JOHN Q. ADAMS, by an effort to present a petition from slaves, has committed a gross contempt of this House.*

"2. *Resolved, That the member from Massachusetts above named, by creating the impression, and leaving the House, under that impression, that the said petition was for the abolition of slavery when he knew that it was not, has trifled with the House.*

"3. *Resolved, That the Hon. JOHN Q. ADAMS receive the censure of the House for his conduct referred to in the above resolutions."*



In the course of the debate, the following remarks fell from Mr. Pickens, of South Carolina:

"As long as we were members of this body, we were bound to maintain its dignity, and do what we could to prevent scenes calculated to harass and insult the feelings of a large portion of the members of this House, by calling down its censure upon the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. ADAMS), for his wanton attempt to introduce the *rights of slaves* upon this floor, and by avowing he held a paper in his pocket purporting to be a petition from slaves, signed by twenty-two. Mr. Pickens said this admitted that he had communication with slaves, and was evidence in law of *collusion*. *It broke down the principle that the slave could only be known through his MASTER*. For this he was INDICTABLE, under statute, for aiding and abetting INSURRECTION: and for such conduct is he not amenable to the censure of this House? The privilege of speech protected a member from being questioned before any other tribunal, but does not exempt him from being questioned before this House."

One whole day having been consumed in this discussion, it was resumed on the following day. Mr. Dromgoole of Virginia then presented the following remarkable substitute for Mr. Thompson's three resolutions:

"Resolved, That the Hon. JOHN Q. ADAMS, a member of the House, by stating in his place that he had in his possession a paper, purporting to be a *petition from slaves*, and inquiring if it was within the meaning of a resolution heretofore adopted (as preliminary to its presentation), has given *color to the idea* that slaves have a right to petition, and of his readiness to be their organ; and that, for the same, he deserves the censure of this House.

"Resolved, That the aforesaid JOHN Q. ADAMS receive a censure from the Speaker, in the presence of the House of Representatives."

The discussion lasted with unabated heat during the whole of this day. Hardly a slaveholder took part in it, who did not express the utmost indignation that any man should dare, in the Congress of the United States, to give "*color to the idea*" that slaves have a right to petition, or congress a right to receive their petitions. On a subsequent day the subject was taken up, and after a most eloquent defence of his conduct by Mr. Adams, the sense of the House was taken on the following resolutions, substituted by Mr. Patton of Virginia:

"Resolved, That any member who shall hereafter present to the House any petition from the slaves of this Union, ought to be considered as regardless of the feelings of the House, of the rights of the southern states, and unfriendly to the Union—and this resolution was rejected—Yeas 92, Nays 105.

"And the main question was then taken on the second branch of the main question, which is as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Hon. JOHN Q. ADAMS, having solemnly disclaimed all design of offering any thing disrespectful to the House, in the inquiry made of the Speaker as to a petition purporting to be from slaves, and having avowed his intention not to offer to present the said petition if the House should be of opinion that it ought not to be presented; therefore, all proceedings in regard to his conduct do now cease.

"This resolution was rejected—Yeas 22, Nays 137."

Thus, by the force of truth and common sense, was the House of Representatives temporarily saved from openly plunging into despotism fouler than ever disgraced any arbitrary monarchy—the despotism of stopping the ear of the law-making power against the cry of the poor. Thus narrowly were the most sacred privileges of our representatives saved from being trampled under the feet of slavery; and thus did the venerable Ex-President of the United States escape the censure of the House for a contempt of its dignity, and *an indictment by the grand jury of the District of Columbia, as a promoter of insurrection!*

But the representatives of slaveholders had not yet showed out the whole of their *hearts*. The outrage upon their "rights" and interests and *fears*, by the *color given to the idea* that slaves have a right to petition, was not to be left unatoned—perish the *Union* first. In solemn procession they left the hall of the House of Representatives, and assembled themselves in conclave. Here they debated the question whether they should all return to their constituents, or dictate terms to the House. A correspondent of the Charleston Mercury writes, "I was pleased at the rebuke with which Mr. Alford (of Georgia) met the suggestion of Mr. Lewis and General Ripley, that the southern members had no business here, and ought to go home in a body, if the attempt to present the petitions of slaves should be tolerated by the House.\* 'No,' said Mr. Alford; 'let us stand or fall at our posts. The ground on which we stand belongs to the southern and slaveholding region; and this city was founded by and bears the name of our beloved Washington, himself a southern man and a slaveholder. *Here let us meet the question, AND LET THIS CITY BE RAZED TO ITS FOUNDATIONS, AND THE POTOMAC ROLL IN TORRENTS OF BLOOD, before we yield it.*'"

\* These suggestions had been made in the House *before* the toleration of the House had been expressed, and were designed to frighten the House from such toleration. But when the southern legislators were by themselves, they considered the Union rather as a matter *to be fought for*, than *run away from*!



Here is the HEART of the SLAVEHOLDER. What is the matter? Has a destroyer threatened to come down upon the patriarchal homes with fire and sword? Has Mr. Adams threatened to violate the rights or interests of the people committed to patriarchal care? No. He has *given color to the idea* that slaves may *petition*. He has offered to speak for the dumb. He has ventured to ask the Speaker of the House of Representatives if he might be permitted to step over the principle that the slave is a mere thing, to be known only through his master. And for this the Potomac is to roll in torrents of blood!

After two separate sessions, the southern delegation returned as they went. They would give up a "Southern Convention," provided the House would reconsider its vote, and declare that slaves have no constitutional right to petition. Although the constitution, without setting up, or in any way indicating, a distinction between freemen and slaves, forbids congress to pass any law abridging the right of "THE PEOPLE" to petition for the redress of *their grievances*, yet the House, at the dictation of a minority, reconsidered its vote, and resolved, only EIGHTEEN MEN voting in the negative, that the slaves have not the right to present the humblest petition, whatever may be their "grievances." Not even the slaves of the District under the exclusive legislation of congress are to be considered a part of the people for whose protection the constitution was established. It is in vain for slaveholders to pretend that slaves are not *people*; the very terms by which they themselves often designate them are, "my people," "our people," "my colored people," "our colored people." So they are *people*, and of course a part of the people of the United States. By this inhuman resolution congress has not abridged, but utterly taken away the right which they as well as we derived from a source higher than the constitution, and which that instrument was designed to protect from their power. This arrogant dictation of the South, and this dastardly succumbency of the North, will go out to the whole world, and down to all time, as a revelation of the falsehood of proslavery pretences, and of the utter rottenness of the *slaveholder's heart*.

We will close this exhibition of the slaveholder's heart by giving a few notes of the echo which the first discussion on this subject in the House of Representatives called forth from the slave states. The following extracts are taken from editorial articles in the three leading newspapers of Charleston, S. C., of February 15, 1837.

The COURIER says:

"We are not well satisfied of either the policy or propriety of hav-



ing asked of congress such a negation of right—the matter was too preposterous in itself to require any action, and such a mode of meeting it was giving too much consequence, if not countenance, to the mad folly of Mr. Adams;—but the question having been made, the constitution of the country and the rights of the South should have insured a different answer.”

The PATRIOT says:

But the South is now aroused by this last act of aggravated wrong, and will proceed, we are sure, in a manner that will vindicate its dignity and protect its interests. . . . . Should it [the first vote] not be reversed, there is no alternative left the Southern members but retiring in a body, and coming home to their constituents.”

The MERCURY, in the true patriarcho-furioso, says:

“The public mind of the South must be now prepared for concerted and decisive action, or it never will be. Public opinion in the South would now, we are sure, justify an immediate resort to force, BY THE SOUTHERN DELEGATION—EVEN ON THE FLOOR OF CONGRESS—were they forthwith to seize and drag from the hall any man who dared insult them, as that eccentric old showman, John Quincy Adams, has dared to do. If there be laws against incendiaries in the District of Columbia, he should be indicted. If the privileges of the House are to screen an abolitionist who holds concert with the slaves of the District, it is time that *Virginia* and *Maryland* should interfere, and PUT DOWN SUCH A NUISANCE AS CONGRESS must be upon their borders.”

Here is the kind, protecting, patriarchal spirit to which we are required to consign two and a half millions of our brethren—manacled and gagged—and to close our lips in eternal silence. Here are the hearts with which we are required to sympathise, on pain of being knocked down and dragged out. Here is the voice of that amiable system to whose dictates we are required to yield, as we value the glorious Union. Is any one so blind as not to see that the heart of the slaveholder must blast and crush and grind to powder every particle of the slave's rights, or interests, or happiness, that stands in the way of its own lusts? Is any one so blind as not to see the danger to our common country of permitting such a heart to riot in the plunder of the helpless, unchecked by exposure, unawed by truth, unscathed by rebuke? Are we to believe that the constitution binds us to sacrifice humanity and duty and conscience to men who hold the eternal foundation principles of that constitution to be an intolerable nuisance? Surely mercy to the master, as well as the slave, binds us to promulgate that truth which alone has the power to heal his cankered, fostered, pestilent heart!

